

RESOLUTION No. 29521

INDEXED

A RESOLUTION relating to Initiative 42 and to the park lands of the City of Seattle; making certain findings in support of the City Council's action in adopting Initiative 42 and requesting reports to the City Council concerning its effectiveness.

Introduced:	<u>1-21-97</u>	By:	<u>Donaldson</u>
Referred:	<u>JAN 21 1997</u>	To:	<u>FULL COUNCIL</u>
Referred:		To:	
Reported:	<u>JAN 27 1997</u>		
Passed:	<u>JAN 27 1997</u>	Signed:	<u>JAN 27 1997</u>
Filed:	<u>FEB - 5 1997</u>	Published:	<u>Little 2pg.</u>

US5171

SMEAD 25 YSP 17704

INDEXED

nd to  
aking  
and

*Full Council so*

Donaldson

COUNCIL

JAN 27 1997

2pg.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE  
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

INDEXED

nd to  
nking  
and

*Full Council vote 9-0*

*Council vote*  
*aldson*

27 FEB

*288*

SMEAD 25 YSP 17704

25 YSP 17704

RESOLUTION 29521

A RESOLUTION relating to Initiative 42 and to the park lands of the City of Seattle; making certain findings in support of the City Council's action in adopting Initiative 42 and requesting reports to the City Council concerning its effectiveness.

WHEREAS, citizens of the City of Seattle circulated petitions seeking the enactment of Initiative 42 into law; and

WHEREAS, King County certified to the City of Seattle that Initiative 42 bore a sufficient number of validated signatures to qualify for transmittal to the City Council; and

WHEREAS, the City Council received Initiative 42 on December 16, 1996; and

WHEREAS, Initiative 42 was referred to the Parks and Public Grounds Committee of the City Council for consideration; and

WHEREAS, City Charter Article IV provides that the City Council may enact or reject such an initiative; and

WHEREAS, all members of the Parks Committee stated that they supported the basic principles reflected in the initiative, but a majority of the members had concerns regarding the use of critical but undefined terms and phrases in the text of the initiative; and

WHEREAS, the majority of the Parks Committee, in a divided report, emphasized their concerns regarding the use of undefined terms, the proper definitions of which could be critical to the effective implementation of the initiative; and

WHEREAS, the Department of Parks and Recreation has special expertise in the management of public park lands, including expertise in developing appropriate rules, policies, procedures, and guidelines in order to effectively implement ordinances pertaining to park lands;

Now therefore,

**BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SEATTLE, THE MAYOR CONCURRING:**

Section 1. The City Council supports the principles reflected in Initiative 42, and therefore, pursuant to Article IV, Section 1, of the City Charter, is enacting Initiative 42 into law.

NOTICE:  
IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE  
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

1 Section 2. The City Council finds that Initiative 42 contains several terms and phrases which  
2 are not defined in the initiative, the definition of which may be critical to the effective implementation of  
3 the initiative. Critical undefined terms may result in legal uncertainty as affected City departments,  
4 particularly the Department of Parks and Recreation, apply the initiative.

5 Section 3. The City Council finds that terms not defined in Initiative 42 are critical in the  
6 effective implementation of this ordinance, including such terms as "preserved", "held", "transaction",  
7 "necessary", and "reasonable and practical alternative".

8 Section 4. The Department of Parks and Recreation is directed to exercise its special expertise  
9 in the management of public park lands and facilities to review current, and where appropriate to develop  
10 new, rules, policies, procedures, or guidelines in order to effectively implement Initiative 42.

11 Section 5. The Seattle City Council finds that provision of utility services is essential to the  
12 well-being of Seattle citizens and that utility extension across or beneath public park lands may be  
13 necessary to provide such service. Seattle City Light and Seattle Public Utilities are directed to review  
14 current, and where appropriate to develop new, rules, policies, procedures or guidelines in order to  
15 effectively implement Initiative 42.

16 Section 6. Affected City Departments shall report to the City Council by \_\_\_\_\_ their  
17 experiences implementing Initiative 42, so that the City Council can evaluate the effectiveness of the  
18 initiative and consider possible improvements.

19 Adopted by the City Council the 27 day of January, 1997, and signed by me in open  
20 session in authentication of its adoption this 27 day of January, 1997.

21 Jan Prago  
22 President \_\_\_\_\_ of the City Council

23 Filed by me this 5 day of February, 1997.

24 Judith E. Papp  
City Clerk

THE MAYOR CONCURRING:

21 Norman B. Rice  
22 Norman B. Rice, Mayor  
23  
24

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE  
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

**From:** Paula Hoff  
**To:** CLERK(JPIPPIN)  
**Date:** 6/12/97 10:59am  
**Subject:** Res 29521problem -Reply

FILED  
CITY OF SEATTLE  
97 JUN 12 PM 5:01  
CITY CLERK

Judith-

Thank you for your e-mail regarding the inadvertent exclusion of a date in Section 6 for an implementation report to the City Council. The intent was to have a review after Initiative 42 had been applied to specific situations. Usually, we would give the legislation a year before we suggest any amendments.

A reporting date of early February of 1998 would achieve our ultimate goal. Since this is an initiative, no actual changes can be made to the legislation until it has been in effect for two years.

Again, I appreciate your catching this omission.

Sincerely,

Paula Hoff, Legislative Aide to  
Councilmember Sue Donaldson

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE  
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

RESOLUTION 29521

A RESOLUTION relating to Initiative 42 and to the park lands of the City of Seattle; making certain findings in support of the City Council's action in adopting Initiative 42 and requesting reports to the City Council concerning its effectiveness.

WHEREAS, citizens of the City of Seattle circulated petitions seeking the enactment of Initiative 42 into law; and

WHEREAS, King County certified to the City of Seattle that Initiative 42 bore a sufficient number of validated signatures to qualify for transmittal to the City Council; and

WHEREAS, the City Council received Initiative 42 on December 16, 1996; and

WHEREAS, Initiative 42 was referred to the Parks and Public Grounds Committee of the City Council for consideration; and

WHEREAS, City Charter Article IV provides that the City Council may enact or reject such an initiative; and

WHEREAS, all members of the Parks Committee stated that they supported the basic principles reflected in the initiative, but a majority of the members had concerns regarding the use of critical but undefined terms and phrases in the text of the initiative; and

WHEREAS, the majority of the Parks Committee, in a divided report, emphasized their concerns regarding the use of undefined terms, the proper definitions of which could be critical to the effective implementation of the initiative; and

WHEREAS, the Department of Parks and Recreation has special expertise in the management of public park lands, including expertise in developing appropriate rules, policies, procedures, and guidelines in order to effectively implement ordinances pertaining to park lands;

Now therefore,

**BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SEATTLE, THE MAYOR CONCURRING:**

Section 1. The City Council supports the principles reflected in Initiative 42, and therefore, pursuant to Article IV, Section 1, of the City Charter, is enacting Initiative 42 into law.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE  
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

1 Section 2. The City Council finds that Initiative 42 contains several terms and phrases which  
2 are not defined in the initiative, the definition of which may be critical to the effective implementation of  
3 the initiative. Critical undefined terms may result in legal uncertainty as affected City departments,  
4 particularly the Department of Parks and Recreation, apply the initiative.

5 Section 3. The City Council finds that terms not defined in Initiative 42 are critical in the  
6 effective implementation of this ordinance, including such terms as "preserved", held, "transaction",  
7 "neccessary", and "reasonable and practical alternative".

8 Section 4. The Department of Parks and Recreation is directed to exercise its special expertise  
9 in the management of public park lands and facilities to review current, and where appropriate to develop  
10 new, rules, policies, procedures, or guidelines in order to effectively implement Initiative 42.

11 Section 5. Affected City Departments shall report to the City Council by \_\_\_\_\_ their  
12 experiences implementing Initiative 42, so that the City Council can evaluate the effectiveness of the  
13 initiative and consider possible improvements.

14 Adopted by the City Council the 27 day of January, 1997, and signed by me in open  
15 session in authentication of its adoption this 27 day of January, 1997.

16   
17 President \_\_\_\_\_ of the City Council

18 Filed by me this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 1997.

19 \_\_\_\_\_  
20 City Clerk

21 THE MAYOR CONCURRING:

22 \_\_\_\_\_  
23 Norman B. Rice, Mayor

24 (Seal)

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE  
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

# City of Seattle

## TIME-ONLY PUBLICATION

The full text of the following resolution, passed by the City Council on May 27, 1997, and published here title only, will be mailed, at no cost, on request for two months after this publication. For further information, contact the Seattle City Clerk at 664-1414.

### RESOLUTION NO. 29423

A RESOLUTION relating to the Department of Parks and Recreation, approving a Master Plan for the redevelopment of the City's one-quarter mile of Central Waterfront properties, consisting of Waterfront Park, The Seattle Aquarium, and Piers 62 and 63, and authorizing the Department to develop a plan, complete with financing alternatives, governance actions, and other elements needed to implement the project.

### RESOLUTION NO. 29531

A RESOLUTION relating to Initiative 42 and to the park lands of the City of Seattle, making certain findings in support of the City Council's action in adopting Initiative 42 and requesting reports to the City Council concerning its effectiveness.

### RESOLUTION NO. 29533

A RESOLUTION relating to the committee structure, membership and meeting times of the Committees of the Seattle City Council for 1997 and superseding Resolution 29506.

### RESOLUTION NO. 29534

A RESOLUTION designating the monthly President Pro Tem of the City Council of the City of Seattle for the year 1997 and superseding Resolution No. 29504.

### RESOLUTION NO. 29536

A RESOLUTION in appreciation of the Citizens Advisory Committee for the development of the Seattle Aquarium's Master Plan: "Portal to the Pacific."

Publication ordered by JUDITH. PIP-PIN, City Clerk.

Date of official publication in the Daily Journal of Commerce, Seattle, February 13, 1997. 2/13/97(77153)

## STATE OF WASHINGTON - KING COUNTY

City Clerk

—SS.

No. 29526/RES BY

## Affidavit of Publication

The undersigned, on oath states that he is an authorized representative of The Daily Journal of Commerce, a daily newspaper, which newspaper is a legal newspaper of general circulation and it is now and has been for more than six months prior to the date of publication hereinafter referred to, published in the English language continuously as a daily newspaper in Seattle, King County, Washington, and it is now and during all of said time was printed in an office maintained at the aforesaid place of publication of this newspaper. The Daily Journal of Commerce was on the 12th day of June, 1941, approved as a legal newspaper by the Superior Court of King County.

The notice in the exact form annexed, was published in regular issues of The Daily Journal of Commerce, which was regularly distributed to its subscribers during the below stated period. The annexed notice, a

CTRT: 29423, 521, 23-24, 94

was published on

02/13/97

The amount of the fee charged for the foregoing publication is the sum of \$ \_\_\_\_\_, which amount has been paid in full.

Subscribed and sworn to before me on

02/13/97

Notary Public for the State of Washington,  
residing in Seattle

Affidavit of Publication

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.